

HONIGMANHonigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn LLP
Attorneys and Counselors

Bradley J. Diedrich

(248) 566-8516

Fax: (248) 566-8517

bdiedrich@honigman.com

Fax Transmission**August 23, 2005****Pages (including cover): 3**

Recipient(s)	Company	Fax Number
Examiner A.M. Dunwoody	USPTO	571-273-8300

209593-81554

Message:

Response to Restriction. Please Enter

S.N. 10/800,537

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**AUG 23 2005**

The information contained in this facsimile may be confidential and may also be subject to the attorney-client privilege or may constitute privileged work product. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent or employee responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, to arrange for return or destruction of the information and all copies. Thank you.

32270 Telegraph Rd. • Suite 225 • Bingham Farms, Michigan 48025-2457

Detroit • Lansing • Oakland County

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office, facsimile no. 571-273-8300, on the date shown below.

Dated: 8/23/05

Signature:

Loyce A. Krumpal
(Loyce A. Krumpal)

Docket No.: 209593-81554
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Gregory A. Haunhorst et al.

Application No.: 10/800,537

Confirmation No.: 1310

Filed: March 15, 2004

Art Unit: 3679

For: FITTING FOR FLUID CONVEYANCE

Examiner: A. M. Dunwoody

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

MS Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 23 2005

Dear Sir:

In response to the election requirement (dated August 17, 2005), applicant hereby elects, with traverse, the claims associated with Figures 6-15, namely, claims 5-28, for further prosecution on the merits.

As noted in MPEP 803, an application may be properly restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if they are able to support separate patents and they are either independent (MPEP §806.04-§806.04(i)) or distinct (MPEP §806.05-§806.05(i)). If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. In the present case, Group II is elected with traverse since it is believed that search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden.

Applicant's election is made without prejudice. As noted by the Examiner, upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to not more than two species in addition to the elected species, provided that all claims to each additional species are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.146.

Application No.: 10/800,537

Docket No.: 209593-81554

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-3145, under Order No. 209593-81554 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 8/23/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Bradley J. Diehr

Registration No.: 47,526

HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ AND
COHN LLP

32270 Telegraph Road

Suite 225

Bingham Farms, Michigan 48025-2457

(248) 566-8516

Attorney for Applicant

OAKLAND976388